

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are in the application of which claims 1, 15, 20, and 24 are in independent form. Claims 5-8, 11, 19, 28, 29, and 32 are objected to. The application is not amended in this response.

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-18, 20-27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rostoker et al. (U.S. Patent 5,563,928). For the following reasons, these rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 recites:

"transmitters to provide transmit signals to chip interfaces;
voltage control circuitry to control voltages of the transmit signals;
receivers to receive external signals from another chip; and
evaluation circuitry to determine whether the transmit signals were usable by the other chip based on an evaluation of at least one of the received external signals and to provide a usability indicating signal to the voltage control circuitry indicative of whether the transmit signals were usable by the other chip." (Emphasis added.)

As is emphasized, in claims 1, it is the voltage of the transmitted signals that is controlled. The Office action, p. 2, states regarding Rostoker et al.: "The Examiner notes that the frequency is a function of the voltage and is used to control the proper interface timing)," While this may be true in Rostoker et al., Rostoker et al. describes a system to control the frequency of a signal, not the voltage of the transmitted signal. For example, Rostoker et al., col. 12, lines 56-63 (cited in the Office action, p. 3), states:

"When a system requires a certain operating speed, the voltage and/or temperature parameters of the integrated circuits may be adjusted so as to realize a minimum appropriate relaxation oscillator frequency for each integrated circuit. Conversely, when the integrated circuits of the system are much faster than necessary for desired operation, the voltage to the integrated circuits may be lowered to reduced power consumption of the system." (Emphasis added.)

Thus, it is voltage that produces a desired frequency of the signal. There is no indication in Rostoker et al., that voltages of transmit signals are controlled.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The rejections of dependent claims 2-4, 9, 10, and 12-14 should be withdrawn for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claim 15 recites:

"a transmitter to provide a transmit signal to at least one chip interface;
voltage control circuitry to control a voltage of the transmit signal;
a receiver to receive an external signal from another chip; and
evaluation circuitry to determine whether the transmit signal was usable by the other chip
based on an evaluation of the received external signal and to provide a usability indicating signal to
the voltage control circuitry indicative of whether the transmit signal was usable by the other chip."
(Emphasis added.)

Claim 15 is very similar to claim 1, and is different from Rostoker et al. for the same reason
as claim 1. Accordingly, the rejections of claim 15 and dependent claims 16-18 should be
withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites:

"transmitters to provide transmit signals to chip interfaces;
control circuitry to control power of the transmit signals;
receivers to receive external signals from another chip; and
evaluation circuitry to determine whether the transmit signals were usable by the other chip
based on an evaluation of at least one of the received external signals and to provide a usability
indicating signal to the control circuitry indicative of whether the transmit signals were usable by
the other chip." (Emphasis added.)

As noted, the system of Rostoker et al. is directed to controlling the frequency of a signal.
There is nothing in Rostoker et al. that describes controlling the power of transmit signals.
Accordingly, the rejection of claim 20 and dependent claims 21-23 should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 recites:

"voltage control circuitry to control voltages of the transmit signals;
receivers to receive external signals from the second chip; and
evaluation circuitry to determine whether the transmit signals were usable by the second chip
based on an evaluation of at least one of the received external signals and to provide a usability
indicating signal to the voltage control circuitry indicative of whether the transmit signals were
usable by the second chip." (Emphasis added.)

The quoted portion is very similar to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 20 and dependent claims
25-27, 30, and 31 and should be allowed for the same reason as claim 1.

It is noted that there are additional reasons why the claims allowable over Rostoker et al.

A notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 7, 2006

/Alan K. Aldous/

Alan K. Aldous

Reg. No. 31,905

Attorney for Intel Corporation

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
Phone: (503) 264-7125
Phone: (503) 684-6200
Phone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile: (503) 684-3245